

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/578,676**  
Response filed March 3, 2009  
Reply to OA dated November 14, 2008

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-11 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 9, and 10 have been amended herein.

1. The Examiner has objected to claim 10 for a noted informality.

Claim 10 has been amended herein in a manner intended to overcome this objection.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection to claim 10 should be withdrawn.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 under U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0023685 (**Nakamura '685**) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198458 (**Kawamura '458**).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

**Nakamura '685** and **Kawamura '458**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended: "determine whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen," in combination with the other claimed features.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/578,676**  
Response filed March 3, 2009  
Reply to OA dated November 14, 2008

**Nakamura '685** and **Kawamura '458**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following combination of features as set forth in claim 9, as amended: "determining whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen," in combination with the other claimed features.

**Nakamura '685** and **Kawamura '458**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following combination of features as set forth in claim 10, as amended: "determining whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen," in combination with the other claimed features.

In view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claims 1, 9, and 10 should be withdrawn. It is submitted that this rejection of claims 2-8 and 11 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

3. The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0023685 (**Nakamura '685**) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198458 (**Kawamura '458**) and U.S. Patent No. 5,947,619 (**Kurashina '619**).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/578,676**  
Response filed March 3, 2009  
Reply to OA dated November 14, 2008

**Kurashina '619** fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of **Nakamura '685** and **Kawamura '458**.

**Nakamura '685**, **Kawamura '458**, and **Kurashina '619**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended: "determine whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen," in combination with the other claimed features.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn by virtue of its dependency.

4. The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0023685 (**Nakamura '685**) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198458 (**Kawamura '458**) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0058715 (**Taniguchi '715**).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

**Taniguchi '715** fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of **Nakamura '685** and

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/578,676  
Response filed March 3, 2009  
Reply to OA dated November 14, 2008

**Kawamura '458.**

**Nakamura '685, Kawamura '458, and Taniguchi '715**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended: "determine whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen," in combination with the other claimed features.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn by virtue of its dependency.

5. The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0023685 (**Nakamura '685**) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198458 (**Kawamura '458**), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0058715 (**Taniguchi '715**), and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0116167 (**Okuzako '167**).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

**Taniguchi '715** and **Okuzako '167** fail to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of **Nakamura '685** and **Kawamura '458**.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/578,676**  
Response filed March 3, 2009  
Reply to OA dated November 14, 2008

**Nakamura '685, Kawamura '458, Taniguchi '715, and Okuzako '167**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended: "determine whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen," in combination with the other claimed features.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn by virtue of its dependency.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/578,676**  
Response filed March 3, 2009  
Reply to OA dated November 14, 2008

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



Darren Crew  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 37,806

DC/lif

Atty. Docket No. **060297**  
Suite 400  
1420 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**  
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE